

REMARKS

Applicants thank the Examiner for considering the references cited in the Information Disclosure Statements filed on October 1, 2002 and April 30, 2001. Applicants note that an **additional Information Disclosure Statement** was filed on February 20, 2004, and respectfully request that the Examiner consider the references cited therein and return a signed copy of the corresponding Form PTO-1449 in the next Office Action.

Claims 21-44 are currently pending in this application. Claims 21, 28, 33, and 38 are independent. Claims 1-20 have been cancelled without disclaimer and without prejudice. Claims 21-44 have been newly added by this Amendment to further clarify the invention. No new subject matter has been added. In view of the foregoing amendments and following comments, reconsideration and allowance of all the claims are respectfully requested.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

Claims 1, 2, 4-7, 9-12, 14-17, 19 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Isomursu et al. (USP 6,400,958).

Applicants disagree with rejections of claims 1, 2, 4-7, 9-12, 14-17, 19 and 20 as set forth by the Examiner. However, the cancellation of claims 1, 2, 4-7, 9-12, 14-17, 19 and 20 has rendered the rejection of these claims moot.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 3, 8, 13 and 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Isomursu et al. (USP 6,400,958), in view of Kobayashi (USP 6,633,759).

Applicants disagree with rejections of claims 3, 8, 13 and 18 as set forth by the Examiner. However, the cancellation of claims 3, 8, 13 and 18 has rendered the rejection of these claims moot.

NEWLY ADDED CLAIMS

Claims 21-44 are supported by the specification as originally filed and have been newly added by this Amendment to further clarify the invention of the instant application.

Independent claims 21, 27, 31, and 35 essentially recite enabling a wireless client device to select at least one application action associated with a selected application residing on at least one server and executing the at least one selected application action on the at least one server. In an exemplary embodiment, request handlers may be located on at least one server, and may provide the ability for a request from the wireless client device to execute an application action associated with a selected application on the server (see the specification at page 12 line 16-page 13 line 2). The selected application action may include opening or closing an application, opening, editing, saving, closing or deleting a document or folder, searching a database (see the specification at page 13 lines 3-8), or configuring user application preferences stored at the server (see specification at page 16 lines 6-20). This may allow wireless client devices such as cellular phones, interactive pagers, personal digital assistants, or another wireless client device, to access applications such as an email application, a calendar application, a personal directory application, a public directory application, or another application, on the at least one server (see the specification at page 16 lines 3-5).

In contrast, Isomursu is drawn to a terminal in a communication network, wherein the

terminal supports a plurality of applications and is capable of communicating user messages (see Isomursu at col. 1 lines 10-13). The user messages communicated by the terminal in Isomursu may contain application data relating to applications that are being run *on the terminal* (see Isomursu at col. 2 lines 13-19, and col. 7 lines 7+). However, Isomursu is silent with respect to enabling a wireless client device to select at least one application action associated with a selected application residing on at least one server and executing the at least one selected application action on the at least one server. Instead, Isomursu discloses executing application actions on the terminal.

The Examiner appears to acknowledge that Isomursu is deficient because it fails to disclose Bluetooth protocol. This feature is no longer claimed. Therefore, the rejection based on Kobayashi is moot. Furthermore, Kobayashi remains deficient because it is silent with respect to enabling a wireless client device to select at least one application action associated with at least one selected file residing on at least one server, and executing the at least one selected application action on the at least one server. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that Isomursu and Kobayashi, both alone and in combination, are deficient because they fail to disclose the claimed invention.

In view of the foregoing differences between claims 21, 28, 33, and 38 and the cited art, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 21, 28, 33, and 38 are believed to be allowable over these references. Further claims 22-27, 29-32, 34-37, and 39-44 are believed to be allowable at least by virtue of their dependency.

Having addressed each of the foregoing rejections, it is respectfully submitted that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the application is in condition for allowance. Notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned attorney.

Dated: April 2, 2004

Respectfully submitted,



Sean L. Ingram

Registration No.: 48,283

MINTZ, LEVIN, COHN, FERRIS, GLOVSKY AND
POPEO, P.C.

12010 Sunset Hills Road, Suite 900

Reston, Virginia 20190

703-464-4800

Customer No.
29315